

## **CIRCULATED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING**

### **ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS REPORT**

**23<sup>rd</sup> May 2017**

#### **Item 8 – DC/16/5039/COU, The Creamery, Angel Link, Halesworth**

Five further objections have been received:

27 Thoroughfare: the only change is the reduction in height of the canopy, but it is still higher than there 1.8m boundary wall. Remain concerned about the impact on their amenity space, noise from pressure washers, overspray of water and cleaning products, fumes from cars with their engines left running. Parking spaces are well used, especially on market days and other special events.

Sonya Holland (address not stated): I am writing to voice my concern and outrage of the proposed application of the car wash facility in Halesworth. In my opinion it is completely unnecessary, it would be an eyesore in a conversation area. Significant noise and overspray nuisance to the businesses and residents in the immediate area. And also a major concern of discharge waste Water, waste & toxins. Please take into consideration my concerns as there are already facilities elsewhere in the town so it's just not needed.

46a Thoroughfare: I am writing to express my concerns for the proposed car wash area in the centre of Halesworth; I have lived in the Thoroughfare for the last 14 years and enjoy the fact I live in a quiet town, which prides itself on small privately owned shops and a strong sense of community.

My concerns for the proposed car wash are:

- 1.) Would be an eyesore in a conservation area, with all the canopies and car wash equipment, I would worry these can be seen from many view points around our town, which would be unattractive.
- 2.) We would loose some of our visitor parking by taking away some pay and display parking.
- 3.) The noise for local businesses and home owners within the immediate area will have an impact.
- 4.) From an environmental view I feel that it's not good for the town as the discharge waste, toxins and chemicals will go into drains and possibly our local Blyth river.

5.) I feel it is unnecessary to have this facility in the centre of town when our petrol stations cater for car washing and also there is a hand car washing facility only 5 mins up the road in Ilketshall.

Mr R A Blouet (address not stated): I have recently discovered the above proposal near where I live in Halesworth. I strongly oppose this planning application for the following reasons:

- There will be a loss of 14 parking spaces in an area where there is a lot of pressure for parking.
- The buildings, canopies and car wash equipment to be installed on this site would have a detrimental effect on this attractive conservation area.
- It would increase traffic congestion coming off Saxons Way into Halesworth.

Therefore I would be grateful if this planning application was rejected.

Philip Mills (address not stated): The above is not needed and shouldn't lose parking spaces.

A further letter of support has also been received:

Durrants, 12 Thoroughfare: I understand that the usual Halesworth paranoia is circulating regarding the above application.

I for one consider that this will be an asset to the town, providing a facility which I am sure will be used, will bring an opportunity for unskilled labour to the town and will use a space which for 95% of the time is not used.

Please consider this application favourably, it will be used by, and a benefit to, many in the town

#### **Item 9 – DC/17/0524/FUL, Fox Covert Farm, Cox Common, Westhall**

No further representations.

#### **Item 10 – DC/17/0561/FUL, 9 Glebe Close, Lowestoft**

Comments from Cllr Mary Rudd:

“Unfortunately I will not be able to make the planning meeting on the 23rd May 2017 and neither will Cllr Steve Ardley so as I called this in I will give my thoughts on this below:

I fully support the Officers recommendation to refuse this application.

This is a case of overdevelopment of the site and is in conflict with DM02. The neighbouring house would have increased noise and disturbance, the proposed access is not wide enough either.

People buy properties in this area for the spacious gardens and once an application like this is given the go ahead it will open up the floodgates for further applications.

As many of the residents have told me they are most concerned about road safety as there is a blind bend in Glebe Close and with vehicles parked on one side of the road nearer Gunton Church Lane it is very difficult to see any oncoming traffic.

I have read through all the letters of objections and agree with all the comment and fully support the recommendation for refusal”

**Item 11 – DC/17/1186/FUL, land and building adjacent The Shrubbery, Clay Common, Frostenden**

This application has been withdrawn from the agenda following the submission of further information by the applicant.

**Item 12 – DC/17/1272/FUL 12 Ashman's Road, Beccles**

Further objection from: **14 Ashman's Road**

I now oppose the application on the following grounds.

The application does not take into consideration it is in a conservation area.

It is far too big for the plot and is not in keeping with any other houses in the area.

It is two and a half times bigger than the existing bungalow and if this application is approved it will surely set a precedent for any other applications in this conservation area.

The roof extension to the west is far too close to our boundary, and it is also vaulted which leaves the possibility of a floor at a later date with windows which would look directly into the gardens of 14 Ashman's road and 17 Grange Road. I suggest the roof might be lowered and windows changed facing west on the other slope of the roof.

In conclusion I would like to thank the applicant for taking on board my request to move the garage back in direct line with my own back and front, and if the plans were amended to accommodate the concerns all the neighbours I am sure there would be no opposition to the proposal.

Further objection from **Little Spinney**

I note from the published responses that minor changes are being made to the original application but we have heard nothing from the applicants as to how they intend to minimise the effect upon our property of the part of the proposed development to the South of No 12 - i.e. the 'kitchen block' and associated connecting walkway. Our home, Little Spinney in Priory Road, is by far the closest and most vulnerable of the neighbouring properties and yet there has been no response to the objections we have made.

Para 4.4 of the Design Principles of the published **Design and Access Statement** states, in relation to the new kitchen area, that *'the small entrance lobby and modest extension are designed to maintain natural light into the neighbouring property to the East, minimising any impact to amenity'*. Figure 8 in the same document shows a photograph of the existing flat roofed garage to be demolished, to be replaced by this part of the development which will completely fill the area in the photograph, will be twice the footprint, with pitched roofs to match the height of the existing roof of the bungalow. This is not a *'modest increase'* and certainly does nothing whatsoever to maintain the amenities to our home. The whole of the western boundary to our home would consist of buildings.

In Para 11.4, the Conclusion to the same document promises *'the utmost respect to the surrounding dwellings'*. If this scheme had genuinely set out to maintain neighbouring amenities, this particular part of the development would have preserved a roof height which mirrored much more closely the building they seek to demolish and replace. Had this been the case the adverse effect upon Little Spinney would have been much less, with no reduction to the footprint/volume of the proposed new kitchen area.

**Objection received from 17 Grange Road:**

Further to my previous correspondence regarding the above application I have now returned from abroad and have been able to view the plans once again with the benefit of being at 17 Grange Road.

My concerns still relate to the increase in size of the proposed extension relative to the existing. Referring to the extension facing west an option would be to reduce the roof pitch to 15%. There are roof tile designs today that can accommodate that pitch, plus the roof light issue would have limited effect at that pitch. Visually it would have limited impact on the adjacent properties than currently exists. I also know this would also appease my neighbour Mr G Crane as we have discussed this and see this option as a solution to all parties as an amendment to the design. As a property developer myself and chartered surveyor this is the usual sort of compromise I would expect to be reasonable and to be given consideration.

I know a site visit has been suggested by other parties and this seems a sensible idea. I don't think the architect has taken any of the neighbours concerns into consideration that has been suggested.

**Item 13 – DC/17/1319/FUL: Valley Farm, Wash Lane, Beccles**

No further representations.

**Item 14 – DC/17/0527/FUL: Bryer, Burton Street, Lowestoft**

Further comments from SCC Highways:

“Considering the recently supplied information Suffolk County Council, as the Highways Authority, retracts our original recommendation for refusal and have the following comments

This proposal is unlikely have any severe impact on the highway network in terms of vehicle volume or highway safety. Therefore, Suffolk County Council does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.”

**Item 15 – DC/17/0856/FUL: 18 Willow Road, Lowestoft**

No further representations